

Modifying N=2 Supersymmetry via Partial Breaking

Evgeny Ivanov, Boris Zupnik *

*Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, JINR,
141980 Dubna, Moscow Region, Russia*

*Talk given at the 31th International Symposium Ahrenshoop
on the Theory of Elementary Particles,
Buckow (Germany), September 2 - 6, 1997*

Abstract

We study realization of $N = 2$ SUSY in $N = 2$ abelian gauge theory with electric and magnetic FI terms within a manifestly supersymmetric formulation. We find that after dualization of even one FI term $N = 2$ SUSY is realized in a partial breaking mode off shell. In the case of two FI terms, this regime is preserved on shell. The $N = 2$ SUSY algebra is shown to be modified on gauge-variant objects.

1. A celebrated mechanism of spontaneous breakdown of rigid $N = 2$ SUSY consists in adding a Fayet-Iliopoulos (FI) term to the action of $N = 2$ gauge theory. Recently, Antoniadis, Partouche and Taylor (APT) [1] have found that the dual formulation of $N = 2$ abelian gauge theory [2] provides a more general framework for such a spontaneous breaking due to the possibility to define two kinds of the FI terms (see also [3]). One of them ('electric') is standard, while another ('magnetic') is related to a dual $U(1)$ gauge supermultiplet. APT show that a partial spontaneous breakdown of $N = 2$ SUSY to $N = 1$ becomes possible, if one starts with an effective $N = 2$ Maxwell action and simultaneously includes two such FI terms.

Here we report on the results of studying the invariance properties of $N = 2$ Maxwell action with the two types of FI -terms in a manifestly supersymmetric $N = 2$ superfield approach. Our basic observation is that after duality transformation of a system even with one sort of the FI term, off-shell $N = 2$ SUSY starts to be realized in a *partial* spontaneous breaking mode. When *both* FI terms are included, this partial breaking is retained on shell by the APT mechanism. We study how these modified $N = 2$ SUSY transformations act on the gauge potentials and find that the $N = 2$ SUSY algebra also undergoes a modification.

2. Let us start from the following representation of the superfield action of $N = 2$ Maxwell theory with the FI term [4]

$$\begin{aligned} S(W, L) &= \frac{i}{4} \int d^4x d^4\theta [\mathcal{F}(W) - WW_L + \frac{i}{2} E^{ik}(\theta_i \theta_k) W] + \text{c.c.} \\ &\equiv S(W) + S_L + S_e, \quad W_L = (\bar{D})^4 D_{ik} L^{ik}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

*On leave of absence from: Institute of Applied Physics, Tashkent State University, Uzbekistan

Here, $\mathcal{F}(W)$ is an arbitrary holomorphic function, W is a chiral $N = 2$ superfield, L^{ik} is a real unconstrained $N = 2$ superfield Lagrange multiplier, E^{ik} is a real $SU(2)$ triplet of constants and $D^{ik} = D^{i\alpha}D_{\alpha}^k$. Varying L^{ik} yields the constraint [5]

$$D^{ik}W - \bar{D}^{ik}\bar{W} = 0 \quad (2)$$

which can be solved in terms of Mezincescu prepotential V^{ik} [6]

$$W \equiv W_V = (\bar{D})^4 D_{ik} V^{ik} . \quad (3)$$

Upon substituting this solution back into (1), the latter becomes

$$S(W, L) \Rightarrow S(V) = S(W_V) + S_e , \quad S_e = \int d^4x d^4\theta d^4\bar{\theta} E_{ik} V^{ik} \quad (4)$$

that is the standard ‘electric’ form of the action of $N = 2$ Maxwell theory with FI term. On the other hand, one can first vary (1) with respect to W , which yields

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial W} = W_L - (i/2)(\theta_k \theta_l) E^{kl} \equiv \hat{W}_L , \quad (5)$$

$$S(W, L) \Rightarrow \frac{i}{4} \int d^4x d^4\theta \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\hat{W}_L) + \text{c.c.} , \quad \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\hat{W}_L) \equiv \mathcal{F}(W(\hat{W}_L)) - \hat{W}_L \cdot W(\hat{W}_L) . \quad (6)$$

In this dual, ‘magnetic’ representation the FI term-modified $N = 2$ Maxwell action is expressed through the dual (‘magnetic’) superfield strength and prepotential W_L and L^{ik} . Thus, (1) is a sort of ‘master’ action from which both the electric and magnetic forms of the $N = 2$ Maxwell action can be obtained (see [2, 8] for a similar discussion of the standard $E^{ik} = 0$ case).

Let us discuss peculiarities of realization of $N = 2$ SUSY in the magnetic representation. The electric action (4) is invariant under the standard $N = 2$ SUSY. The same is true for the dual actions (1), (6) in the absence of the FI term. However, if $E^{ik} \neq 0$, the conventional $N = 2$ SUSY gets broken in (1), (6). The only way to restore it is to modify the transformation law of W_L

$$\delta_{\epsilon} W_L = i(\epsilon_k \theta_l) E^{kl} + i(\epsilon Q + \bar{\epsilon} \bar{Q}) W_L , \quad (7)$$

where $Q_{\alpha}^i, \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}^i$ are standard generators of $N = 2$ SUSY. It is easy to find the appropriate modified transformation of L^{ik} .

An inhomogeneous term in the $N = 2$ SUSY transformation law means spontaneous breakdown of $N = 2$ SUSY. To see which kind of breaking occurs in the case at hand, let us firstly discuss the standard electric action (4).

Spontaneous breaking of $N = 2$ SUSY by the FI term is related to the possibility of a non-zero vacuum solution for the auxiliary component $X^{ik} = -\frac{1}{4} D^{ik} W|_0$

$$< X^{ik} > \equiv x^{ik} \sim E^{ik} . \quad (8)$$

Provided that such a solution of the equations of motion exists and corresponds to a stable classical vacuum, there appears an inhomogeneous term in the on-shell SUSY transformation law of the $N = 2$ gaugini doublet $\lambda^{i\alpha}$

$$\delta \lambda^{i\alpha} \sim \epsilon_k^{\alpha} E^{ik} , \quad (9)$$

ϵ_k^α being the transformation parameter. Thus there are Goldstone fermions in the theory, which is a standard signal of spontaneous breaking of $N = 2$ SUSY. Since the inhomogeneous terms in (9) appear as a result of solving equations of motion, it is natural to call $\lambda^{i\alpha}$ *on-shell* Goldstone fermions. As the matrix E^{ik} is non-degenerate, *both* $\lambda^{1\alpha}, \lambda^{2\alpha}$ are shifted by independent parameters, and so they both are Goldstone fermions. Thus, with the standard electric FI term, only *total* spontaneous breaking of $N = 2$ SUSY can occur (actually, for one vector multiplet this is possible only in the free case, with quadratic function $\mathcal{F}$ [7]).

In the dual, magnetic representation of the same theory corresponding to the actions (1) or (6) the situation is radically different: the off-shell transformation law (7) contains an ‘inborn’ inhomogeneous piece. This leads us to interpret the magnetic gaugini as *off-shell* Goldstone fermions.

Both gaugini are shifted in (7), so at first sight we are facing the total off-shell spontaneous breaking of $N = 2$ SUSY in this case. However, by a proper shift

$$W_L \rightarrow \widetilde{W}_L = W_L + \frac{1}{2}(\theta_i \theta_k) C^{ik}, \quad (10)$$

one can restore a homogeneous transformation law with respect to *one* of two $N = 1$ supersymmetries contained in $N = 2$ SUSY (it is easy to find the appropriate redefinition of L^{ik}). The object $\widetilde{W}_L$ transforms as follows

$$\delta_\epsilon \widetilde{W}_L = (\epsilon_k \theta_l)(C^{kl} + iE^{kl}) + i(\epsilon Q + \bar{\epsilon} \bar{Q}) \widetilde{W}_L. \quad (11)$$

One can always choose C^{ik} so that

$$\det(C + iE) = 0. \quad (12)$$

This means that $C^{ik} + iE^{ik}$ is a degenerate symmetric 2×2 matrix, so it can be brought to the form with only one non-zero entry. As a result, $\widetilde{W}_L$ is actually shifted under the action of only *one* linear combination of the modified $N = 2$ SUSY generators $\hat{Q}_\alpha^{1,2}$. The same is true for the physical fermionic components: only *one* their combination is the genuine off-shell Goldstone fermion.

Thus we arrive at the important conclusion: in the dual, magnetic representation of $N = 2$ Maxwell theory with FI term $N = 2$ SUSY is realized *off shell* in a *partial spontaneous breaking mode*, so that some $N = 1$ SUSY remains unbroken.

It is straightforward to show that the action (6) leads to the same vacuum structure as the original electric action (4). Thus on shell in the magnetic representation we again encounter the total spontaneous breaking of $N = 2$ SUSY.

3. Let us show that the phenomenon of partial breaking of $N = 2$ SUSY becomes valid both off and on shell upon adding to the ‘master’ action (1) the new sort of FI term, the ‘magnetic’ one:

$$S(W, L) \Rightarrow S(W, L)' = S(W, L) + S_m, \quad S_m = \frac{1}{8} \int d^4x d^4\theta M^{kl}(\theta_k \theta_l) W_L + \text{c.c.}, \quad (13)$$

M^{ik} being another triplet of real constants. It is easy to show that S_m is invariant under the Goldstone-type transformation (7).

When one descends to the electric representation of (13) (by varying L^{ik}), the only effect of the magnetic FI term S_m is the modification of the constraint (2):

$$D^{ik}W - \bar{D}^{ik}\bar{W} = 4iM^{ik} . \quad (14)$$

It suggests the redefinition

$$W = W_V - \frac{i}{2}(\theta_i\theta_k)M^{ik} , \quad (15)$$

with W_V satisfying eq. (2) and hence given by eq. (3). This shift amounts to the appearance of the constant imaginary part $-(i/2)M^{ik}$ in the auxiliary field of W ,

$$\hat{X}^{ik} \equiv -\frac{1}{4}D^{ik}W|_0 = X^{ik} - \frac{i}{2}M^{ik} .$$

The inclusion of magnetic FI term cannot change the standard transformation properties of W under $N = 2$ SUSY. Then the relation (15) requires to modify the transformation law of W_V , and, respectively, of V^{ik} on the pattern of eq. (7)

$$\delta_\epsilon W_V = i(\epsilon_k\theta_l)M^{kl} + i(\epsilon Q + \bar{\epsilon}\bar{Q})W_V \quad (16)$$

(it is easy to find the appropriate transformation law of V^{ik}). In other words, $N = 2$ SUSY is now realized in a Goldstone-type fashion in the electric representation as well, but with M^{ik} instead of E^{ik} as the ‘structure’ constants. So, when both FI terms are present, there is no way to restore the standard $N = 2$ SUSY off shell. The same arguments as in the previous Section show that $N = 2$ SUSY in both representations is realized off shell in *the partial breaking mode*.

A general electric effective action of the abelian gauge model with the (E, M) - mechanism of the spontaneous breaking can be obtained by substituting the expression for W , eq.(15), into the action (13):

$$S_{(E,M)} = \left[\frac{i}{4} \int d^4x d^4\theta \mathcal{F}(W) + \text{c.c.} \right] + \int d^4x d^4\theta d^4\bar{\theta} E_{ik} V^{ik} . \quad (17)$$

Taking the standard vacuum ansatz

$$\langle W_V \rangle_0 = a + (\theta_i\theta_k) x^{ik} , \quad (18)$$

it is easy to show that the superfield equation of motion following from (17) implies the following equations for moduli a, x^{ik}

$$(i) \ x^{kl} = \frac{1}{2\tau_2(a)} \left(\tau_1(a)M^{kl} - E^{kl} \right) , \quad (ii) \ \tau' \hat{x}^{ik} \hat{x}_{ik} = 0 , \quad (19)$$

where

$$\tau = \mathcal{F}'' = \tau_1 + i\tau_2 , \quad \hat{x}^{ik} = \langle \hat{X}^{ik} \rangle = x^{ik} - (i/2)M^{ik} .$$

A crucial new point compared to the case of $M^{ik} = 0$ is that the vector $\hat{x}^{ik} = x^{ik} - (i/2)M^{ik}$ is *complex*, so the vanishing of its square does not imply it to vanish. As a result, besides the trivial solution $\tau' = 0$ [7], eq.(ii) in (19) possesses the non-trivial one

$$\tau' \neq 0 , \quad \hat{x}^{ik} \hat{x}_{ik} = 0 . \quad (20)$$

This solution amounts to the following relations

$$\tau_1(a) = \frac{\vec{E}\vec{M}}{\vec{M}^2}, \quad |\tau_2(a)| = \frac{\sqrt{\vec{E}^2\vec{M}^2 - (\vec{E}\vec{M})^2}}{\vec{M}^2} = \frac{|\vec{E} \times \vec{M}|}{\vec{M}^2}. \quad (21)$$

This is just the vacuum solution found in [1] based on the component version of the action (17). It triggers a *partial* spontaneous breaking of $N = 2$ SUSY down to $N = 1$. Only one combination of gaugini is the Goldstone fermion in this case.

Thus, the phenomenon of the off-shell partial breaking of $N = 2$ SUSY is preserved on shell, provided that both electric and magnetic FI terms are included.

4. The modified $N = 2$ SUSY, when realized on the superfield strengths (eqs. (7), (16)), still closes on space-time translations. One can wonder how it is realized on the gauge-variant objects: gauge potentials and prepotentials. The $N = 2$ SUSY algebra itself proves to be modified in this case. We will demonstrate this in the $N = 1$ superfield formalism, on the example of the model considered in Sect. 3.

We define

$$W = W_V + \hat{x}^{ik}(\theta_i\theta_k), \quad \langle W_V \rangle_0 = 0. \quad (22)$$

Decomposing W_V in powers of $\theta_2, \bar{\theta}^2$

$$W_V = \varphi(x, \theta_1) + i\theta_2^\alpha W_\alpha(x, \theta_1) + (\theta_2)^2(1/4)(\bar{D}_1)^2\bar{\varphi}, \quad (23)$$

it is easy to find how the $N = 1$ superfield components $\varphi(x, \theta_1)$, $W^\alpha(x, \theta_1) = (\bar{D}_1)^2 D^{\alpha 1} V$ behave under the modified $N = 2$ SUSY transformations (16). We will be interested in how the latter are realized on the $N = 1$ gauge prepotential $V(x, \theta_1, \bar{\theta}^1)$. Modulo gauge transformations, the $N = 2$ SUSY acts on V as (we choose the $SU(2)$ frame so that $M^{12} = 0, M^{11} = M^{22} = m$)

$$\delta V = m(\bar{\theta}^1)^2 \theta_1^\alpha \epsilon_{\alpha 2} + (i/2)\theta_1^\alpha \epsilon_{\alpha 2} \bar{\varphi} + \text{c.c.} + i(\epsilon_1 Q^1 + \bar{\epsilon}^1 \bar{Q}_1)V. \quad (24)$$

Defining $Q_\alpha \equiv Q_\alpha^1$, $S_\alpha \equiv Q_\alpha^2$, one finds that the (anti)commutation relations of the $N = 2$ SUSY algebra are modified as follows:

$$\{Q_\alpha, S_\beta\} = \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} G, \quad \{Q_\alpha, \bar{S}_{\dot{\beta}}\} = G_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}, \quad (\text{and c.c.}). \quad (25)$$

The newly introduced generators possess the following action on V

$$GV = (i/2)m(\bar{\theta}^1)^2, \quad \bar{G}V = (i/2)m(\theta^1)^2, \quad G_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}V = im\theta_{1\alpha}\bar{\theta}_{\dot{\beta}}^1, \quad (26)$$

and are easily seen to be particular $N = 1$ gauge transformations. Thus, off-shell $N = 2$ SUSY algebra turns out to be non-trivially unified with the gauge group algebra. Such a unification does not contradict the famous Coleman-Mandula theorem. Indeed, in gauge theories it is impossible to simultaneously satisfy two important conditions of this theorem: manifest Lorentz covariance and positive definiteness of the metric in the space of states. Note that the $N = 2$ transformation (24) is defined up to pure gauge terms which are capable to change the above algebra. However, in the closure of spinor generators one will always find some gauge generators in parallel with 4-translations. An interesting problem is to construct a non-linear realization of this modified $N = 2$ algebra along the lines of ref. [9]

and to compare it with that constructed in [9] based on the standard $N = 2$ algebra. It is also tempting to elaborate on a possible stringy origin of the modified algebra.

Finally, we would like to point out that the difficulty with the self-consistent incorporation of charged matter hypermultiplets into the $N = 2$ Maxwell theory with the two sorts of FI terms recently discussed in [10] is directly related to the modification of $N = 2$ SUSY algebra in the presence of these terms. The standard minimal coupling of the q^+ hypermultiplets to the harmonic superspace $N = 2$ Maxwell potential V^{++} [11] is not invariant under the modified $N = 2$ SUSY.

Acknowledgement. We are grateful to J. Bagger, E. Buchbinder, A. Galperin, S. Krivonos, O. Lechtenfeld, D. Lüst, A. Pashnev and M. Vasiliev for useful discussions. This work was partially supported by the grants RFBR-96-02-17634, RFBR-DFG-96-02-00180, INTAS-93-127-ext and INTAS-96-308. B.Z. is grateful to Uzbek Foundation of Basic Research for the partial support (grant N 11/97).

References

- [1] I. Antoniadis, H. Partouche and T.R. Taylor, Phys. Lett. B 372 (1996) 83
- [2] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 426 (1994) 19
- [3] S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. B 376 (1996) 275
- [4] E.A. Ivanov and B.M. Zupnik, Preprint JINR E2-97-322, hep-th/9710236
- [5] R. Grimm, M. Sohnius and J. Wess, Nucl. Phys. B 133 (1978) 275 ;
M.Sohnius, Nucl. Phys. B 136 (1978) 461
- [6] L. Mezincescu, “On the superfield formulation of $O(2)$ -supersymmetry”, Preprint JINR, P2-12572, Dubna, 1979 (In Russian)
- [7] A. Galperin and V. Ogievetsky, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 15 B (1990) 93
- [8] M. Henningson, Nucl. Phys. B 458 (1996) 445
- [9] J. Bagger and A. Galperin, Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 1091
- [10] H. Partouche and B. Pioline, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 56 B (1997) 322
- [11] A. Galperin, E. Ivanov, S. Kalitzin, V. Ogievetsky and E. Sokatchev, Class. Quant. Grav. 1 (1984) 469